# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*

## The Japanese and Militarism

*By Walter B. Bullen*

---

American Neutrality *Versus* Oriental War - - - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

How To Combat Anti-Semitism in America - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Massachusetts' Guilty Conscience - - - - - - - *Blanche Gilman Watson*

---

The Study Table

VOLUME CXX NUMBER 2

Chicago, September 20, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Semi-Monthly* *Subscription $3.00*
*Until Further Notice* *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
*"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*



*Board of Directors*

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

*Editorial Contributors*

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO

*Poetry Editors*

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

*Foreign Representatives*

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH


## Contents


EDITORIAL—

Notes ..... 19

ARTICLES—

The Japanese and Militarism—WALTER B. BULLEN ..... 22

American Neutrality *Versus* Oriental War—BRENT DOW ALLINSON ..... 24

How to Combat Anti-Semitism in America—VICTOR S. YARROS .. 27

Massachusetts' Guilty Conscience—BLANCHE GILMAN WATSON .. 29

POETRY—

If I Were— LUCIA MORSE RIMBACH ..... 21

Beyond Fascism—ROBERT WHITAKER ..... 26

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Strange Dialogue / A Verse Play for Radio } JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ..... 30

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Money Mystery—FRANK E. GANNETT ..... 31

John Brown and Sacco-Vanzetti—MARCUS TAYLOR ANDERSON ... 32

THE FIELD—

Why Gas Masks? / No Profits—No Orders } *Nofrontier News Service* ..... 18


## The Field

***"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."***

### Why Gas Masks?

Eight million gas masks are said to be available now in England in the program to provide a mask for every civilian. At the same time the opposition to this kind of "protection" is steadily increasing. The objectors declare that there is no safety in the masks and that the entire plan is a maneuver to silence the opposition.

What a military man thinks of gas masks is strikingly revealed in Major-General J. F. C. Fuller's recent book, *Toward Armageddon.* Says the well-known British soldier:

> I consider that gas masks will prove a godsend. Not that the enemy is more likely to use gas bombs than high explosive and incendiary, but they will give terror-stricken people something to do. In any case, once they are adjusted, they will prevent those wearing them shrieking and moving freely, and if they half-suffocate their wearers, anyhow panic will be half-suffocated in its turn.

This gets fairly close to the statement of General F. P. Crozier, a leader of the Peace Pledge Union, that "air raid 'precautions' are part of a propagandist, mesmeric effort to make you die quietly." Interestingly enough, the heads of the fighting forces do not plan to remain at Whitehall in the event of war, but will go to some "secret mansion in the country."

Meanwhile the official plan for recruiting members of the Post Office staffs for anti-air raid training has met with the opposition of the Union of Post Office Workers. A circular inviting volunteers for training met with very poor response. Thereupon the tactics were changed and the members of the staff were ordered to notify their superior officers if they do *not* wish to undertake training. This form of semi-compulsion has been widely criticized and many refusals have been registered.

*Nofrontier News Service.*

### No Profits—No Orders

Ransomes and Rapier, Ltd., huge British engineering firm, recently received a lesson in the ethics of munitions manufacture. The Government approached them on the question of making shells, and the directors, who do not like the munitions business, agreed to do so, provided the government supplied the necessary machinery. This is a common procedure and the company might have gone ahead and made profits ranging between 20 to 1,200 per cent.

But Mr. R. R. Stokes, the managing director, who describes himself as a "practical pacifist," added another stipulation. He would make shells—with-

(*Continued on Page* 32)

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXX MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1937 No. 2

### TIME

"Why sit'st thou by that ruined hall,
Thou aged carle so stern and grey?
Dost thou its former pride recall,
Or ponder how it passed away?"

"Know'st thou not me?" the deep Voice Cried;
"So long enjoy'd, so oft misused—
Alternate, in thy fickle pride,
Desired, neglected, and accused!

"Before my breath, like blazing flax,
Man and his marvels pass away!
And changing empires wane and wax,
Are founded, flourish, and decay.

"Redeem mine hours—the space is brief—
While in my glass the sand-grains shiver,
And measureless thy joy or grief,
When Time and thou shalt part forever!"

*Sir Walter Scott*

---

## JAPAN, CHINA AND RUSSIA

We do not pretend to understand all that is going on in China these days—why, for example, there should be that dreadful fighting in Shanghai when the seat of the Japanese invasion is in the North around Peiping! Has Japan laid out no plan of action? Are the Japanese and Chinese like so many hungry dogs which fight wherever they chance to meet? This and other things are mysteries. But there remains one thing as plain as a pikestaff, and that is that the occasion of Japan's new attack upon China is the collapse of Russian military power in the massacre of the "red" generals. We now know what we did not know before—that the Soviet government is utterly demoralized. Whether this demoralization is the cause of all the recent slaughter of the old Communist leaders, generals, officials, and others who have really been traitors, or whether the demoralization is the result of this slaughter as the mad attack of a ferocious Stalin upon men who dare dispute his power, we do not know. Nobody knows! It remains for history to tell us what has been happening. But that the demoralization is there, that Moscow for the moment at least is paralyzed inwardly and outwardly, that the whole Bolshevik experiment may be on the verge of collapse or overthrow, this is now certain. Japan would never have moved again into China, especially so soon after the Manchukuo exploit, had she not been perfectly sure that Russia, her one rival and enemy in the East, was impotent. What this disclosure now means in Asia, in the continuing dismemberment of China, is evident. What it may mean in Europe, in possible moves by Hitler, is dreadful. Once let *der Fuehrer* become convinced that Stalin is as helpless on the western frontier as he is on the eastern, then look out! Danzig, the Polish corridor, Czecho-Slovakia, the Ukraine, all these are plums ripening on the tree, and we may be sure that Hitler will pluck them if Stalin cannot move.

## IS IT WAR OR NOT?

The long delay in putting into effect the U. S. Neutrality Law as applied to the Sino-Japanese situation has raised the question—when is a war not a war? This question seems to be as baffling as the earlier question—when is a war an aggressive war? Everybody agrees today that an aggressive war is a crime and must be punished. This is a great gain in human thinking, for there was a time when there were no distinctions between wars, and fighting for its own sake was deemed good. But now nobody justifies fighting except in defense of property, or soil, or lives. The defensive war is right, most people would say, as the aggressive war is wrong. But no sooner do we achieve this beneficent discrimination than aggressive wars disappear, and all wars suddenly become defensive wars. Thus, in the World War, every belligerent was fighting to defend itself against an attacking enemy. More lately, in the Ethiopian War, Italy was fighting to defend itself against the aggression of the dark-skinned Africans. All of which means that we are right back where we started, with everybody fighting when he wants to fight! The same situation seems now to pertain in the matter of war and peace. The United States has passed a law providing that, in case of war anywhere in the world, this country shall apply a ban of neutrality on the belligerents to the end of keeping us out of the field of combat. Neutrality is to mean hands off, no trading, no profit-making,

no entanglements, when nations fight! But fighting has broken out in China on an enormous scale, and the Neutrality Law at this date of writing has not been applied. Reason? There is no war! It is true that armies are mobilizing, that navies are blockading eight hundred miles of coastline, that battles are being fought, that cities and villages are being bombed, that thousands of persons are being slaughtered. But this isn't war! The people of Shanghai evidently think it is war—at least they are fleeing. The Japanese government thinks it is war—at any rate they are transporting armies as fast as they can to Chinese soil. But there has been no declaration of war—so peace still prevails! And we can go right on selling our goods to Japan and China at an enormous profit! It is comforting to note that, on this basis, we have an answer to the question as to the next war. There will be no next war! It is peace that will wipe us out.

## IS THE NEW DEAL DONE FOR?

The more one ponders the record of the last Congress, the more one marvels that such wreckage should follow upon the sweeping triumph of the 1936 campaign. Who could have imagined, after the November election, that the President would thus be routed in the first year of his new administration? Is it strange that the country is asking if this is the end of the New Deal? It would be hasty, we think to pass any such judgment as this, if only for the reason that Mr. Roosevelt himself is primarily responsible for the debacle which his leadership has suffered. At the heart of all the trouble, and in the end the occasion of all the disaster, stood the Supreme Court Bill. Unthought of in the campaign, unmentioned in the President's inaugural address and first message to Congress, unannounced to party leaders when at last formulated, the Bill fell upon Senate and House like a thunderbolt which shattered the whole edifice of party discipline and public morale. For five months this measure blocked the life of Congress. Everything else was stopped—and when at last the obstacle was removed, it was too late to do anything. Had it not been for this unprecedentedly stupid procedure on the part of the Executive, it is inconceivable to us that even an unfriendly Congress could have made such havoc of administration policies. For Congress *is* unfriendly—a fact which may make it in the end not at all a hasty thing to prophesy the collapse of the New Deal! What we see at last is what some of us have seen from the beginning, and that is that the Democratic Party has no use for the New Deal. Glad to follow any leadership out of the political wilderness, frightened by the depression emergency, the Democracy grabbed Roosevelt and held to him with the frenzy of a drowning man. But the Party, its strength rooted in the South, is only more conservative than the Republicans, and now is ready to scuttle ship. This means precisely the chaos under the Roosevelt leadership of the Democratic Party which we knew must come sooner or later. The President has been fooling himself and incidentally the country. What he has been preparing for us is an overwhelming conservative reaction, with no hope for the New Deal except in a third party which means business. Some day labor, the liberals, the public will find this out—and then we'll get somewhere.

## THE MINISTER AND THE LABOR QUESTION

Should the minister of a church take an active part in labor disputes? Well, it seems to depend! A certain minister in Philadelphia not long ago, took a hand in a local strike, and fought against the C. I. O. on behalf of the employer. His reward was an attack upon his house, the breaking of doors and windows by thrown bottles and brickbats, and anonymous letters bidding him get out of the labor dispute and go back to the church where he belonged. At about the same time of this minister's experience in Philadelphia, other ministers in Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago were actively espousing labor's cause in pitched battles with the factory owners and the public authorities. These clergymen, it is needless to say, were not exhorted by labor to go back to their churches where they properly belonged, but on the contrary were welcomed with open arms. It was the employers in these cities who were outraged by the spectacle of ministers going outside of religion to join in labor's struggles. Yet at this same time in Johnstown the organizers of the Citizens' Committee to fight the C. I. O. and labor generally were receiving ministers into membership and eagerly electing them to office. Here is confusion worse confounded. But, so far as we can make it out, the logic of these experiences would seem to be that it is all right for ministers to be active in the capital and labor conflict *if they're on the right side* in that conflict! If they're not on the right side—i. e., on *our* side—then capital combines with labor, and labor with capital, in damning the clergyman for his impudence and ordering him back to his altars. All of which, of course, is absurd! A minister is either under spiritual obligation to apply his religion to labor and other social questions, or he is not yet Nazi-land, he has the inalienable American right to be free in his convictions, and to support either party to the struggle which seems to him to be serving the public welfare. We think that the labor cause is right, whatever the mistakes of labor leadership; we want to see labor win. But we had rather have a

minister support the side of the employers through thick and thin, than to hug the so-called sanctities of his office and say that labor questions are none of his concern.

### MONEY THE ROOT . . .

What money does to human nature has never been more amusingly stated than by Congressman Maury Maverick in his current widely-discussed autobiography. In the midst of the darkest hours of the depression this energetic and public-spirited man founded a coöperative camp in San Antonio for the help of starving transients. All went well until some of the residents got RFC and army project jobs. Then, writes Maverick:

> Castes began to form. . . . One man worked thirty hours in a week and got a dollar an hour. He had been the meekest, most respectable and hard working man in the colony. He drew his thirty dollars . . . arrived on the scene tight as a drum, . . . beat his wife, turned capitalist and left. Tony, an ex-sailor, made twelve dollars and forty cents, . . . began dressing up, . . . ran off with somebody's wife and three children, as ambitious a financier as I ever knew. . . .

The "castes," of which Maverick speaks, were threefold, curiously corresponding to the class divisions of society:

> The penny caste was composed of those who had less than a dollar and they were the advanced thinkers. Those who had over a dollar but under five dollars were the liberal Democrats . . . a little worried about radicalism. Those having over five dollars were the Tories and reactionaries and looked on the others . . . as a proletarian mob.

Everything went to pieces, in other words, just as soon as income, or rather inequality of income, began to intrude. The coöperative undertaking simply couldn't stand the strain. Human nature, in other words, went to pieces. This is the experience, incidentally, of every coöperative enterprise, isolated, like an island in the sea, in the midst of a competitive economy. Only communities sustained by a profound religious conviction have ever been able to endure under such conditions, and most of these have sooner or later collapsed or been corrupted. The only solution to the question, as we see it, is an all-inclusive coöperative society in which all will have not only the opportunity but the duty to work productively for the commonweal, and all will receive, on a reasonably equitable basis, income from their labor. The Scandinavians seem to be approaching this ideal in their great national coöperative systems. Is it not conceivable that eventually we shall all live together in society as we live together in families—as "members one of another"?

### ANDREW MELLON

The late Andrew Mellon was a pitiful rather than a tragic or terrible figure. We never could join in the laudations lavished upon him when he was Secretary of the Treasury under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. He was an infinitely abler and more appropriate figure in that office than the present occupant, Mr. Morgenthau, Jr., but it always seemed ridiculous to us to refer to him as "the ablest secretary of the treasury since Alexander Hamilton." On the other hand, we were never able to join in the vilification which was poured upon Mr. Mellon by his political opponents and by liberals generally. The income-tax inquiry addressed against him, for example, we regarded as a gross and villainous case of sheer spite or ill-will, all too characteristic of the Roosevelt administration. As for Mr. Mellon's business activities, we have always believed that he was a typical specimen of the capitalistic regime, able, shrewd, honest according to the accepted standards of his class, with not a trace of the sheer wickedness characteristic through so many years of the late John D. Rockefeller. Of course, Mr. Mellon will be remembered not for his political record which was insignificant, nor for his business achievements which were commonplace, but for his unprecedented art benefactions which have already laid in Washington the foundations of one of the greatest art galleries in the world. Here is another typical aspect of our world—an age of commercial and financial exploitation hiding its realities, and perhaps easing its conscience, in such gifts to the general good as mankind has not known since the days of the Italian Renaissance. The comparison is apt!—the Renaissance in Italy was characterized by unparalleled corruption, cruelty, and vast accumulations of wealth gathered from impoverished populations, all ending in such artistic and educational benefactions as the world has not seen until the modern age. Mr. Mellon was one of the greatest of our commercial princes—and in his art dreams was worthy of his place.

---

### If I Were——

I'd ride the highways up and down,
I'd scatter health through every town;
The weight of worry dull as lead
I'd lift from every weary head.
I'd leave prescriptions by the pound
For spreading happiness around;
I'd sweep disease from every door
With magic brooms from Circe's shore.
I'd fire the hearts of young and old
To star in miracles untold
And Poverty would never dare
To breed its bastard in this air;
Maternity I'd make an A r t——
It is the overflowing heart.
I'd never rest from year to year
Until the world was rid of fear;
Across the seas to every land
I'd offer friendship's cordial hand;
Wherever man might challenge Fate
I'd make of Life an open gate.

Lucia Morse Rimbach.

# The Japanese and Militarism

WALTER B. BULLEN

If you had been born in Japan, if you had been instructed for six or for the full eleven years in the local schools, if your background were only Japanese, and you had lived only in the Japanese atmosphere, how would you view the present situation in China? In this country public school education, though not affecting the population so universally as in Japan and not so uniformly good in quality, has yet qualified most of us to read the Hearst press and so to know about Japan and Mexico. In Japan great masses read a daily paper and little else. I having lived in northern New England had to go abroad six summers ago to learn of the Scottsboro boys, but about them the Russians were amply informed. How well do ordinary folk in Japan understand the situation in China and the views of the Chinese? Do they not read of numerous instances, unknown to us, of wrong done to the Japanese? Do you not suppose that these cases rouse their emotions? Is it to be doubted that they believe that their cause is just?

If we wish to understand the Japanese and their courses of action, let us make another approach. Anglo-Saxon political theory has depended on two rival parties which from time to time succeed each other in power. It is the duty of the minority party to oppose the government. The theory is carried to striking expression in the British practice of a large salary or appropriation paid to the leader of "His Majesty's loyal opposition" in order that he may have staff assistance sufficient to enable him to function efficiently. In Japanese life the family system is fundamental and determinative. By ancient custom the family controls the individual. Thus the young people traditionally have but a minor part even in the matter of their mating. The family council dominated by the elders settles important issues for the different members. All interests are to be conserved and harmonized with patient consideration and forbearance, that there may remain no proper ground for dissatisfaction. Thereafter acquiescence is binding on all concerned. The point of view and methods of dealing with individual claims carry over into social and political life. Under the Constitution the Diet is not authorized to initiate policies. "Duties of consent" are its portion. To the government's proposals it may assent or may not—as is the case with a young person for whom marriage plans have been made.

There are parallels in the West to the Japanese procedure. Loyal Fascists, particularly their Grand Council or the Cabinet, may discuss *pro* and *con* until *il Duce* announces his decision. In the Soviet Union "millions make the plan" and millions write their ideas to the newspapers, but when the Party Line has been laid down, conformity is the only appropriate course. In the Roman Catholic hierarchy, earnest, confident men seventy years ago opposed the novel doctrine of papal infallibility; none has done so since July 18, 1870. There is an American tradition which demands that party lines end at the water's edge. And unanimous consent plays a large role in the United States Senate.

The Japanese shrink from settling questions by majority vote, for they would not leave any minority in the position of being coerced or overruled. Why should he be thus made to lose face? "The majority rules" is not a cry to ease the feelings of a disappointed oriental. It ought not to be difficult for thoughtful people to recognize the fact that ideals along with immense social pressures work to effect solidarity of sentiment and unity of action in the Far East where any approach to steam-roller methods would seem crude and be repugnant to reasonable men considerate of the sensibilities of all their associates. With us, dissent may betoken a virile and discriminating mind; with them, it rather smacks of obtuseness, discourtesy, presumption, and contumacy. Furthermore, the oriental mind is impressed with the danger that individualism may be divisive, dispersive, disintegrating, and destructive. Indeed, is not the tide in the occident setting strongly toward collectivism? Upon reflection, then, does it seem very surprising that since the Japanese military spread their control over all Manchuria, there has come to be general acquiescence in the startlingly transformed national policy?

Japanese feudalism was military. No doubt the *noblesse* of France and the lords and gentry of England originally received land titles in recognition of military status and services, but with the passage of time the military aspect of landholding disappeared. Not so in Japan! Down to 1871 most of the country's area was made up of fiefs occupied by *daimyō* who were still military chieftains with their numerous vassals settled about them armed, hardy, versed in military arts and receiving from their lords their income in the form of assignments of rice. They were two-sword men, as anyone observed who saw them. Only these Samurai were genuine persons in old Japan. The common people had no legal rights as against them, but were dependent on their forbearance and sense of propriety. To them and their wives Japan's culture belonged. High standards had they, and it was to them that honor and dignity appertained. Did you ever read the winning exposition of Japan's moral code by the liberal Friend, Dr. Nitobe? "Bushidō" is literally the way of the warrior.

Who was it that enfranchised the common people in Japan? The Samurai leaders, following upon the Restoration of the Emperor! With a rapidity that startled friendly foreign advisers, the privileged status of the Samurai was done away with as part of a general reconstruction program carried into effect within the space of ten years. The people had not pressed for nor even craved legal and political emancipation and privilege. The clear-eyed Samurai leaders had seen it to be necessary for Japan's participation in the life of the modern world. Such leadership the body of the people were content to support and prolong. Members of the two great southwestern clans of the Restoration, Satsuma and Chōshū, largely controlled Japan for many years. Even beyond the Meiji era (1867-1912) the Sat-Chō clique kept its hold on the army and navy. So Samurai leaders carried Japan through the perils of reconstruction and prevented foreign aggression. Japan was a small island nation facing the great continental states, Russia and China. In between, "like a dagger aimed at the heart of Japan," lay Korea. Her weakness and political corruption invited foreign intervention. Russia had come like a glacier across northern Asia. She had also obliged the yet unequipped Japan to yield her large island of Sakhalin, under the form of exchange, for the tiny

Kurile Islands. Men then queried whether it was to be the fate of the newly awakened land to be smothered or overwhelmed by colossal Russia. Is it strange that the Japanese not at all militarist in spirit should deem the militarists entitled to the nation's gratitude as having, through their wars, saved Japan from destruction and given her breathing space?

The new Japan has all along been an arena in which, under many formations and influenced by various motives, a struggle has gone on between the military mind and method and the civilian. In 1873 the most eminent of Japan's vigorous young leaders were members of the Iwakura Embassy engaged in visiting the advanced nations of the world to learn whatever might be of benefit to their ambitious land. Suddenly they started back to Japan because of the imminence of war against Korea. Upon arrival this group of Samurai unitedly insisted there must not be war. They promptly squelched the bellicose element who were kept in hand for twenty years. Marquis (later Prince) Itō, survivor of the Iwakura group, framed a Constitution based on divine right and employing devices suggested by Prussian practice. The party leaders, however, were eager to expand their power and for four years from 1890 the governments had a hard time with them. In consenting to war with China, in violation of a treaty in force for a decade, Itō made the capital blunder of his career. When Cleveland's Secretary of State, Gresham, was told by the Japanese minister that there was to be war to divert attention from domestic difficulties, he could not believe his ears. Itō was never again able to get the upper hand over the military party. He struggled to do so for the rest of his long life, twenty-five years. At the close of the Sino-Japanese War, Yamagata, shrewd and dogged leader of the military party, while president of the Privy Council, had the rule adopted that colonial governors should be chosen from among generals or admirals of the first or second rank. Particularly as the inhabitants of Formosa had taken up arms rather than be turned over to Japan, the proposal seemed very reasonable, and without opposition it was also provided that the ministers of war and of the navy should come from the same ranks. Consequently the closely-knit officers at the head of the army and the navy have had a whip hand over every premier. Thus, when the Hirota cabinet fell in January, General Ugaki, commissioned by the Emperor to form a cabinet, had to give up because the military clique, apparently considering him too moderate, would not supply the required high officers for the military portfolios.

Let us now glance at what Japanese liberals since the World War have been able to do, despite the prestige and the entrenched position of the militarists. While red Russians were still weak, the Japanese troops occupying eastern Siberia were withdrawn. This was a bitter pill for the militarists and other expansionists to swallow. Japan joined the League of Nations, and the Japanese rendered it excellent service. Japan joined the World Court, and when matters came to a head in Manchuria, it was a distinguished Japanese who was the Court's president. Under the chairmanship of the broadminded Baron Shidehara, the Japanese delegation joined in the treaties framed at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments. Save for the two years of General Tanaka's discredited premiership, the Baron was Japan's minister of foreign affairs in every cabinet for ten years. Students and intellectuals had long been growing liberal, and with such support Shidehara stoutly resisted the advocates of a "strong" or "positive" policy on the continent. In 1930 the London Treaty of Naval Limitation was ratified over military men's protests. All this time the militarists, with their powerful means of propaganda, were trying to turn Japanese opinion against the foreign minister and his policy. The killing of Captain Nakamura and sundry anti-Japanese incidents in China were well played up in 1931. Persistently and patiently for long years had Baron Shidehara striven to settle by negotiation with China issues that were numerous and complicated. At last constructive results seemed to be assured. A Sino-Japanese conference was agreed upon which should take up all outstanding issues. The members met in Tokyo to organize on September 19, 1931. It was too late! The night before, the Manchurian incident had burst upon the world. The army commanders in southern Manchuria and in Korea had taken the bit in their teeth. By their defiant actions they contradicted the assurances of the government and made it appear guilty repeatedly of duplicity. Unable to carry out its policies the government in a few weeks had to give up the struggle and resigned. The turn of the advocates of force had come.

Why had the policy of conciliation toward China failed of results? Do you recall the conditions in China after the spectacular rise of the Nationalists? Anti-foreign agitation was rampant. The western powers had yielded to China and were continuing to yield. The British had given up their concession at Hankow. Was it strange that eager, enthusiastic nationalists should think that they could get whatever they went after hard? The "young marshal," Manchuria's governor, recklessly seized the Chinese Eastern Railway. The Chinese in bumptious mood were not interested in stupid negotiations. The Chinese in thoughtful mood, facing the disparity in military strength, no doubt questioned whether their representatives would be able to negotiate with the Japanese on equal terms. In China experience in dealing with aggressive foreign powers had made shifty diplomacy its standard, excelling in obstruction. In the case of Japan, China held off too long.

The "positive policy" toward China has now with variations been prevailing for six years. In the Tokyo garrison mutiny of February 26, 1936, the extremists overreached themselves. Executions resulted, and widespread punishments in the form of demotions and transfers. And now the military have got the country deeply involved in China, with commitments which may exhaust their strength and resources! It is one thing to achieve ends by a show of force and another to coerce an aroused and united nation, the most populous on earth and the most capable of enduring hardship and loss of life.

The Japanese are acting like other peoples in falling in line, though many hearts are sore, when the drums beat and the trumpets sound and the government calls for patriotic support. What about the Christians? In our land, with the channels of information wide-open and discussion unfettered, what proportion of the good Christian folk are convinced pacifists who can be relied on to stand against any wave of war psychology? Some such there are in Japan. What about youth in Japan? Youth is beautiful in its en-

thusiasms, but there are alternations and fashions in enthusiasms as well as in politics at large. Do you recall the promising liberal youth movement in Germany following the war? There, in a few years, youthful idealism was diverted. With the reaction in Japan against internationalism and liberalism, youth for the most part became impatient with a program which seemed colorless, slow, ineffective and even insincere and went to one extreme or the other. But when the philosophy of force, now so fully deployed, has run its course and wrought its inevitable results, may not Japanese youth turn wholeheartedly against it? Of late years not a few Japanese youth have been eager to extend a brotherly hand and to share in conferences with the youth of the lands against which there has been much antipathy.

Do you think it would make you sick to be called on for the bloody work required of Japanese in China? From Shanghai in January, 1932, "homesickness," it was reported, obliged the commanders to return several hundred soldiers and sailors to Japan. Near Okayama wives and mothers lay down on the rails in front of a troop train crying, "We won't let our husbands and sons go to their death!" Mothers and children at that sad time would go to the shrines in Japan to pray not for victory but for peace and the end of fraternal bloodshed. Those who have ever lived happily among the Japanese cannot in these bitter days forget those gentle, sensitive, kindly, friendly, buoyant, playful folk, ever mindful of any little favor received, tenderly considerate of others, matchless and unflagging in their courtesy.

---

# American Neutrality *Versus* Oriental War

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

The harrowing conflict in the Far East—the undeclared and dishonorable war carried by the Japanese militarists and imperialist Samurai into the teeming, tortured coasts of tragic China—presents not merely another demonstration of the awful price of the international political anarchy in which we live, but also an acid-test of that solemn pretense of "respect for the sanctity of international engagements" to which Secretary of State Hull in July directed the attention of the chancelleries of the civilized world. It presents likewise a challenge and a timely test of the new-old American neutrality policy and law, enacted on April 29 last, for the third successive time in two years, by Congress, and reluctantly accepted by the "controlled" press and the Administration as basic and democratically directed foreign policy of the American people anticipating war.

This historic policy, reaffirmed in revised and extended form, has been steadily opposed and discredited by the editors and columnists of the largest metropolitan newspapers, and by the business and banking interests whose opinions they constantly reflect, because they do not wish to approve, or to be required to make, any substantial interruption of "business as usual" not absolutely necessary or imposed by belligerent aggression. On the contrary, they expect to be undisturbed, and even protected, in carrying on their profitable private enterprises, howsoever they may jeopardize the national interest. Having followed the flag of Commodore Perry and the vanguard of the Christian missionaries to the ancient East, Big Business and the international bankers with their diplomatic consorts and consortiums have given far too many hostages to fortune and economic imperialism to surrender easily to the patriotic demands of even the most prudent and ethical of policies declared at home, demanding withdrawal of naval protection abroad, and even temporary suspensions of private mercantile adventures overseas, if necessary, for the sake of the nation's general peace and welfare. Such is the real issue of the present controversy between our neutralitarians and economic interventionists which has sundered the peace movement in opposing cantonments! It is—as the President himself warned that it would become, in his memorable Chautauqua address last summer—the fateful issue of profits versus peace for the United States, and others, with the result hanging upon the control of public opinion. Hence the attempts to discredit the new neutrality and delay its enforcement in the present conflict—for which the President alone is responsible to Congress and the country.

Strangely enough, the Administration itself has also resisted acceptance and fulfillment of the considered mandate of the representatives of the people, and for a variety of reasons—because the State Department desires a free, diplomatic hand in every crisis; is more concerned about the finesse of diplomacy than moral principle; leans towards "sanctionist" interventionism in theory and professional interest (as expounded at Geneva); and hesitates to recognize the angry fact of war in the Orient, and the delictual conduct of Japan in particular, lest, by such recognition, diplomatic maneuvering be cut short, China disadvantaged, Britain offended, and a costly interruption of lucrative commercial processes precipitated. But all of these reasons are unconvincing; and the delay is extremely dangerous, if not unlawful. For China would not be disadvantaged in the long run, and ought not to be encouraged to fight the Japanese military and naval juggernaut in an unequal and merciless struggle. Tory Britain would be pleased—and would, in all probability, promptly seek to capture the war-trade which our Neutrality Act proscribes for American citizens, with the object of refraining and restraining Americans from directly abetting the slaughter. And the Act was passed after mature deliberation by both houses of Congress and full committee hearings, with exactly this kind of international berserking, which now devastates Shanghai and Chahar, in view.

Not only has the Supreme Court, in a recent decision, fully sustained the constitutionality of authorized embargoes against the war-traffic with belligerents, but undeniably it was the clear intention of Congress to require interruption of normal commercial processes, and particularly to prohibit the traffic in contraband with belligerent governments and factions, in time of war. It was its intention to make this interruption and prohibition "automatic," and to remove it so far as possible from Executive discretion or delay, once the fact of public armed hostilities of international scope and danger unquestionably exists. It does now exist, in China, for reasons which are neither simple nor

apparent. Have the President and his Department of State any right in law or ethics to defeat or nullify the force of a major mandate and careful, considered policy ordained by the national legislature? . . . To do so is to court political disaster and risk national stultification. The fact of public war, whether declared and admitted or not, between Japan and such responsible governments as exist in China is now undeniable. Military outrages have been committed, huge war-loans are being authorized and contracted, at home and abroad, by Japanese and Chinese ministers of state; cities are cruelly bombed and burned; thousands have been slain. . . . Whatever may be the policy of Great Britain and the imperialist powers of Europe, the American Neutrality Act must and should be enforced by the President on principle—without fear or favor or further delay, and without discrimination between the combatants, one or both of whom are flagrantly violating the solemn terms of the Kellogg Pact and the Nine Power Treaty, guaranteeing the political and administrative integrity of China. This cannot be too strongly emphasized, in time of Executive hesitation. Such is the first necessary step towards peace, but only the first.

Meantime, while the President delays or temporizes and public opinion remains in a cataleptic twilight-sleep, oblivious of our international sins of omission, or commission, consider the shameful record of what is happening. In a striking dispatch from Washington on September 3rd, the alert staff of the United Press summarizes what is known of the facts:

> American and British banks are helping to finance Japan's undeclared war on China, even as the American and British governments are bending every effort to halt or minimize the conflict, the United Press was informed today by an unusually reliable source.
>
> Two large American banking corporations, it was revealed, have extended credits to the Japanese government. They are continuing to do so, despite the fact that American government funds have been allocated as secured credits for the Chinese government. This arrangement was made recently by the treasury department and Chinese Finance Minister Kung.
>
> Thus, it was stated, American dollars are helping to finance the slaughter on both sides of the controversy, just as the products of certain munitions manufacturers were found to be spouting death simultaneously from guns of opposing armies during the world war.
>
> Until recently the British pound sterling was in a similar position. British banks were extending credits to the Japanese government while Japanese guns and aerial bombs were spreading death and destruction in British-owned commercial establishments in Shanghai.
>
> The credits to the Japanese government were secured by Japanese-owned gold, on deposit here or in England or in transit, and by Japanese government obligations. *On Aug. 25 or 26 the British banks gave notice that they would no longer grant credits on Japanese gold.* Whether they are continuing to grant credits on Japanese government bonds and notes could not be definitely ascertained.
>
> The two American banks, however, signified their intention of continuing their financial transactions, United Press was informed, granting credits on both gold and Japanese government paper.
>
> It was pointed out that there is no legal prohibition against credits or loans to either the Japanese or the Chinese government at the present time. Neither is affected by the Johnson law prohibiting credits or loans to governments in default on their debts to the United States government.

But both *are* affected, and would be prohibited, by the new Neutrality Act, if the President invokes and enforces it as it was unquestionably intended and supposed that he would do, whether other exporting and industrial nations join us in doing the same thing or not. Obviously, the duty of our diplomacy is to persuade them to do so; but Congress did not make the law conditional upon the coöperation of other nations. It declared in categorical terms that the people of the United States are prepared to sacrifice the blood-stained profits of the contraband war-traffic, and to require their financial institutions to refrain from advancing profitable loans and credits for war-purposes. It enacted this resolution into law, in language as explicit as could be found; and it laid upon the President the duty of carrying out the national policy, thus declared, in time of crisis and international conflict. It can hardly be doubted that, if Congress were in session today, ways would be found to compel the President to recognize the war and enforce the law. His failure to do so, in the writer's view, has become a national scandal.

It is important to understand this matter, and to realize that the new American Neutrality Act raises a standard of national and of international conduct of neutrals towards belligerents to a higher level than was ever attained before, by voluntarily imposing upon our own government and citizens a series of realistic restraints and duties, in time of large-scale foreign war. It does so both as a means of safeguarding our own moral integrity and economic welfare, and of making war itself more costly and difficult to wage. Such is its historic and political importance. Obviously, however, it cannot become a potent international "sanction" against warfare—an "automatic" police-measure of restraint implementing the Kellogg-Briand Pact,—which it ought to become, until the other great industrial states, the principal sources of the raw materials and fabricated weapons of war, likewise assume and undertake to enforce within their own jurisdictions the same standard of restraint and lawful conduct towards belligerent violators of the Pact, without judging or discriminating between them—at least at the outset—even as a policeman does not discriminate between the parties to a brawl on the public highways, but separates and restrains the combatants, until they and their controversy can be brought before a judge.

If we deny loans and arms to Japan and China now, and the finance ministers of both succeed in obtaining huge credits for war-purposes (in exchange for political and economic "concessions") from Britain, France, Germany, or even Soviet Russia—we have merely penalized our own bankers and merchants, traders and travelers, without greatly affecting the war-makers and naval buccaneers. Nevertheless, we are on the right track; and it behooves our diplomacy to pursue courageously the objective of winning the understanding and support of progressive and civilized public opinion in the great democratic states—which are, as it happens, likewise the chief industrial and creditor states, and the principal sources of the munitions and machinery of modern warfare. This is the way forward to the light! For the new neutrality can only become really effective, as a restraint of war, when it becomes multi-lateral or collective, and is recognized and enforced as living international law, by the coöperation of all the great law-abiding and respecting states. But some government must take the initiative in earnest.

The American Act—pursuing a tradition as old as the nation, and as distinguished as the founder of the policy, George Washington,—requires the undelayed imposition of restraints and embargoes by the President: restraints upon enlistment in foreign armies and

on the giving of aid or unneutral service; embargoes upon the exportation of a long list of absolute contraband, specified as "arms, ammunition and implements of war," and including poison gases, chemicals, and aeroplane engines and parts. (The list may be extended, by the President, from time to time, as the behavior of belligerents and the conception of what is contraband changes.) It prohibits all loans or credits for war-purposes, and makes unlawful the sale of the securities of belligerent governments or factions in the United States. It now prohibits, likewise, travel by Americans upon belligerent (in this case Japanese) merchant-ships; and imposes a considerable number of other economic penalties and disabilities against both, or all, belligerents, on the assumption that it requires two parties at least to make a war—and that *both may be at fault* in breaking the peace.

Howsoever imperfect, or imperfectly understood and misconstrued may be this legislation, by those who are unfriendly to it, it contains serious curtailments of belligerent rights and privileges within American jurisdiction, new to history and strongly savoring of a positive and automatic sanction against war,—albeit framed and phrased as if it were merely a domestic measure to protect the lives and property of American citizens from threat of injury or loss in time of war. If augmented by further restrictions upon the exportation of "munitions," i. e., commodities and materials useful, or essential, in warfare, other than arms, the effect of the legislation will be of even greater disadvantage to Japan than to China, in the present conflict, for the reason that the Island Kingdom is much more dependent upon continuous supplies of raw materials from overseas than is China. This is especially true of oil and gasoline for the Japanese navy and air-force and motorized units of the army; of iron and steel, cotton and copper, nickel and rubber.

*Thus the future belongs to the neutrals, if they choose to exercise their potential power;* and the world community has but to realize itself in the collaborative action of four or five great neutral states acting under law for the suppression and restriction of the key-minerals of warfare, for the institution of modern war—which now overshadows and terrifies the civilized world in a way intolerable to its more intelligent and sentient spirits—to be banished to the limbo of human bondage, blood sacrifice and the Inquisition. For the Achilles' heel of Mars is to be found in the dependence of all the minatory military states and dictatorships—particularly the most aggressively belligerent among them—upon importations from other lands of the essential raw material of war. The failure of the League of Nations' "sanctions" to deter the aggressor in the case of the Italian-Ethiopian War was a *political* failure, arising from the facts that they were directed solely against one side by a political rather than a juridical process; that the prime mover—Great Britain—was not disinterested in mobilizing them—and all the world knew it; and that the measures taken were neither "automatic," nor thoroughgoing. For the Tory British Government declined to embargo the sale and shipment of British petroleum to the Italian army in Ethiopia when the United States Government was prepared to prohibit by law, if necessary, the shipment of American petroleum, and other key-minerals, to both belligerents, as a part of the economic duties of the new neutrality. Thus, neutral collaboration failed at the critical point, for political reasons, and the international economic front crumbled under moralistic-imperialistic direction when it would not have failed under an impartial administration of modernized international law. The attack of the neutrals was levelled against Italy in 1935—as our own was levelled against Germany in 1917—rather than against *war* and the crime of belligerency itself. Both failed of their larger purpose for the same reasons. Such is the lesson of the years.

Neutrality, therefore, in the eyes of American history and law, has ceased to be merely a matter of political indifference to foreign conflict, or a legal quibble, behind the mask of which unrestrained economic intervention and profiteering may go forward with the blessing and protection of the Government. It has become something much more honorable than a political gesture or an example of international inertia. It has expanded and expurgated itself, in the act of renewing its vitality; and it may easily become a positive "sanction" of peace and of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, as the immediate future may very conclusively demonstrate—if President Roosevelt embraces the opportunity that is his. At the least, the American law now requires that commercial behavior on the part of individual Americans shall tally with the public policy and political attitude of the Government, as expressed in its treaties and declarations. . . . Here is a concrete good and gain,—if there were nothing more. The economic umbilical chord that has drawn us resistlessly into the vortex of foreign wars has been partially cut, at last—*if the law is enforced.* Everything depends upon that.

---

**Beyond Fascism**

When fell Jerusalem of old,
And Babylon prevailed,
With what dismay their hearts grew cold
Who feared that God had failed.

And when upon Golgotha's cross
The Christ was crucified,
How utterly were they at loss
Who thought that God had died.

Again and yet again the same,
While the slow ages run,
The rack, the scaffold, and the flame,
And always God undone.

Yet forth from every ill success,
From all defeat of truth,
There dawns a larger righteousness,
There lives a wiser youth.

Thus do men's partial failures drive
Toward unities at last
Wherein their later counsels hive
The wisdoms of the past.

—Robert Whitaker.

# How to Combat Anti-Semitism in America

VICTOR S. YARROS

Anti-Semitism is a deep-seated social disease. In order to combat it effectively, one must diagnose it correctly—a very difficult task. Hundreds of able thinkers have attemped that task, and they do not agree. We certainly cannot fold our hands and wait till the learned doctors do agree. But, obviously, the remedies proposed have to be provisional and tentative. Fortunately, despite many differences, sincere, thoughtful, and informed persons readily admit that certain steps—very important steps, in fact—can and should be taken here and now, in the United States, with the view of checking and eradicating anti-Semitism, which is an evil from the point of view of civilized non-Jews as well as of Jews of all sorts and conditions.

This short paper will limit itself to a consideration of the possible, feasible, and fruitful steps toward the goal in question.

First, however, we must recognize and avow the truth that the term "prejudice" does not quite adequately describe the attitude or sentiment of the anti-Semitic hosts. Anti-Semitism is more than a prejudice; it is a feeling. Jews are *disliked,* although individual Jewish men and women have many sincere friends among the Gentiles and there is genuine personal affection and admiration for them. Even in liberal and enlightened circles, Jews in the mass are, as a rule, sneered and railed at; and greed, aggressive pushfulness, vulgarity, ostentation, and trickery are assumed to be Jewish traits. "To Jew one down" is a familiar phrase, of course.

An intellectual prejudice, based on error, can be removed by argument and by factual proof. An antipathy will resist any appeal to reason and to history. And in combating anti-Semitism it is antipathy that has to be reckoned with, not mere "error of the mind."

How is that irrational and gratuitous antipathy created and cultivated? The answer is clear enough. Children, in their most impressionable years, hear all sorts of sarcastic and disparaging remarks about the Jews—spoken of as an essentially alien element, a foreign body in the national organism, a body that has to be tolerated, perhaps, but that socially cannot be accorded equality of treatment. Jews, the children are told, at least in the orthodox religious circles, crucified Jesus, the Lord and Savior of Mankind; Jews, the children of the more liberal parents are told, claim to be superior to other races, and, in truth, *are* "smart," but they use their ability in objectionable and odious ways, to get ahead and to undersell competitors. Jews are clannish and rather loud. They make buildings, hotels, and restaurants undesirable by their noise and bad manners generally. Jewish lawyers are more sophistical and less scrupulous than Gentile lawyers. And so on, and so on.

In schools, on the street, in public places, Jews are looked at with suspicion and distrust. They are expected to behave queerly and unpleasantly. If one of them does so behave, the whole race is indicted upon the basis of that instance.

Further, as children grow up, they learn that Jews are barred from certain apartment houses, resorts, and coöperatives; that they cannot become members of golf clubs, country clubs, lodges, what not. The exclusion is justified by the great majority of Gentiles, or, at least, accepted and acquiesced in.

Under these circumstances, it is natural that actual dislike for Jews, as a people, should develop and spread. Even those who boast of their freedom from *prejudice* will admit, in their candid moments, that they cannot rid themselves of the *feeling* they have against Jews.

With the foregoing as premises, let us turn to the question of ways and means of eradicating the antipathy.

The experience of Russia under the new regime yields one valuable lesson—namely, that anti-Semitism begins early, and in the home and elementary school. Children must not hear contemptuous references to Jews or their alleged racial Jewish characteristics. Adults must learn to repress the tendency to condemn Jews *en masse,* or as a race. They must recall Lessing's great drama, *Nathan the Wise,* and its moral—to treat the Jew as an individual and judge him by his own conduct, bearing, and spirit. In Russia, we are assured, the children and the adolescents have quite forgotten what anti-Semitism means. They have not seen, heard, or read anything that would have taught them that vice. If this be true of Russia as a whole, then we have remarkable proof of the influence of education, negative and positive. Certainly, the child can be educated upward as well as downward.

However, if adults—parents, relatives, neighbors, friends—must discipline themselves and refrain from inculcating anti-Semitism either deliberately or through careless, casual, and loose remarks, the problem obviously becomes one of re-educating and reconditioning the adults. How is this to be done, and by whom?

America cannot do what Russia has done — make anti-Semitism a criminal offense, a counter-revolutionary manifestation. No libel law punishing anyone for anti-Semitic charges, or sentiments, or innuendoes, is possible here. Juries and public opinion would nullify any libel law that might stretch the reasonable definition of *personal* defamation.

The appeal, then, must be to public opinion and to the moral and spiritual leaders of the public.

There is reason to believe that such an appeal would not fall on deaf ears. The Reconciliation movement in the churches is encouraging as far as it goes. Conferences and meetings to combat racial and religious prejudices and antipathies have done considerable good, and should be continued and multiplied. The priests, ministers, rabbis, and prominent lay churchmen should organize such conferences and meetings in every community, and carry on their educational work systematically, not sporadically. The discussions and resolutions of such conferences should be given full local publicity.

In addition, the churches, colleges, and technical or professional schools should be requested to offer and broadcast lectures in opposition to anti-Semitism. Those Gentiles who think they have valid and rational criticisms to advance against this or that Jewish practice, institution or claim should be invited and encouraged to come forward and frankly and fully state their case. Any valid point made by these should receive due consideration.

The Press should be asked to take part in the cam-

paign by opening its pages to discussions of all the aspects and angles of anti-Semitism. What is now gossip, rumor, and insinuation should be brought out into the light of day.

Finally, those organizations, clubs, and industries which overtly or secretly discriminate against Jews should be earnestly urged to abandon their reactionary policies, and gradually—not suddenly—admit fit, qualified and companionable Jews to membership strictly on their individual merits and records. It is a disgrace to any University Club, for example, to have a constitution which would bar from membership a Justice Brandeis, a Professor Einstein, a Julius Rosenwald, a Herbert Lehmann, a Serge Kussevitsky!

How cultivated, self-respecting American Gentiles can justify such policies on the part of clubs and other organizations passes comprehension. Perhaps the issue has never been raised—it would be "unpopular" and "unpleasant."

But, if the issue of anti-Semitism is to be raised and stressed till it is solved in a civilized way, the Gentiles themselves should raise it. It concerns them as much as it does the Jews. The problem, rendered particularly tragic by the policies of the German reactionaries and gangsters, must be solved the world over, and the professed followers of the lowly Nazarene, the greatest of all Jews in the estimation of sincere Christians, must coöperate in effecting that solution.

In so far as anti-Semitism is stimulated and fanned by malicious, ignorant, psychopathic individuals—and there are such everywhere—individuals who do not shrink from employing criminal methods, such as circulation of forgeries and notorious falsehoods, recourse should be had to the criminal law. Not a single instance of this sort of poisoned propaganda should be allowed to pass unchallenged. People often interpret silence as indicative of fear and lack of confidence. Exposure and refutation of wilful and mendacious charges against a race or a group impress thousands who pay little attention to quiet, judicious forms of discussion. And heavy fines or other penalties are not without deterrent effect in the small but noxious circles addicted to falsehood and fraud.

In short, the way to combat a grave injustice is to combat it aggressively and fearlessly in the name of decency, humanity, peace, and truth.

However, the Jews, for their part, should not limit themselves to the refutation and denunciation of the silly, contradictory, and baseless charges leveled at them by the anti-Semitic agitators. This necessary task should and must be accompanied by considerable heart-searching and self-examination. The question should be asked candidly: Are the Jews in America, or elsewhere, in any way or degree responsible for the hostility and dislike with which they are treated? Are there any sins of omission or commission, or both, which it is their duty to acknowledge and take steps to purge themselves of even at the cost of pecuniary and other sacrifices? What reproach may *fairly* be laid at the door of the Jews as a social group?

The writer of these lines is aware of two indictments that have been returned against Jews by earnest, unprejudiced, high-minded persons. The late Jane Addams, for example, whose passion for justice never was doubted by the hosts who knew her, felt and said to intimate friends that it is a great mistake for the Jews to neglect and avoid farming as a way of life and a means of livelihood. It is natural, human nature being what it is, to resent the fact that there are too many Jewish doctors, lawyers, merchants, and brokers. Medical schools, law schools, hospitals, and clinics complain, she pointed out, of the annual "invasion" of the medical and legal professions by Jewish graduates. Jewish boys and girls should be advised to study agriculture, horticulture, engineering, and like vocations instead of taking the lines of least resistance and pushing themselves into the already overcrowded professions or businesses.

This is sound and wholesome counsel. Moreover, Bacon observed that trickery was almost inseparable from trade; and when Jews are accused of trickery, it is the *trades which they pursue that are really thus indicted.* All trading peoples—the Greeks, the Armenians, etc.—have been accused of deceit and trickery. The fault is more with the trades, yet it is the people in the trades that are blamed and condemned. The question is not one of legal right, but of human attitudes and reactions.

There are, of course, adequate historical explanations of the Jewish neglect of agriculture. But the causes which resulted in the anomoly under discussion no longer operate. Jews may acquire and own land, and till the soil as their forefathers did. The drift toward cities, and especially metropolitan cities, must be checked and, indeed, a movement back to the land launched and aided.

The second indictment is that which *The Christian Century* has recently presented and very ably defended —namely, that Jews are wont to claim that they, as Jews, possess some profound and precious religious asset to which no Gentile may aspire. In other words, the Jews are in fact *a chosen people,* with exceptional spiritual gifts and qualities which cannot be shared with any other race or group. Such pretensions, however inoffensively put forward, are bound to excite resentment. True, they are compatible with a spirit of tolerance, but tolerance is not enough. Sympathy, appreciation, and comprehension are essential to interracial and inter-group concord and respect. Of what wonderful and noble moral and spiritual quality have the Jews a virtual monopoly? Certainly not of the quality of righteousness, or of mercy, or of humility. What, then, is that mysterious and unique gift? The Old Testament fails to mention it; the prophets are silent regarding it. Is it impossible for the best Gentiles "to do justly, love mercy and walk humbly"? Assuredly, it is not impossible. Is there something which Micah overlooked? If so, what is it? Let it be proclaimed that the differences between Jews and Gentiles are temperamental, not moral or intellectual.

Jewish leaders and thinkers will do well to ponder the above queries and make honest and conscientious answers.

If the Jews do *their* part, the anti-Semitic groups will be deprived of some of their most effective weapons. The campaign against anti-Semitism will be a long one; victory will not be achieved easily or spectacularly. But patience, perseverance, courage, and prudence will yield fruit in time.

---

*"New, bold and inspiring ideas are only born of a clear head that stands over a glowing heart."*
—Horace Mann

# Massachusetts' Guilty Conscience*

BLANCHE GILMAN WATSON

A remarkable book went on display in the windows of Boston's book shops the last week of August, 1937, a book characterized as "magnificent" by one of the critics. It was sponsored by the Governor of the state who had announced that he was going to recommend that it be placed in the public schools. The Secretary of State was evidently so pleased with it that he set down his own signature under that of the Governor when the latter gave his endorsement of the last proof sheets. And above these signatures were written these words:

> "As Governor of the Commonwealth I am happy that this *valuable* work is being made available to the citizens of Massachusetts and the nation." (Italics added.)

Something was thereby "made available . . . in the nation" which the Governor was supposed to have known about, but that "something" acted like a bellows which was to fan into a belated glow embers that had lain for ten years outwardly cold and dead.

What was it?

It was merely 45 lines distributed in various places in this book of some 700 pages, 45 lines on the subject of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. One paragraph contains this statement—and surely it embodies nothing of which a large part of the world is not today cognizant! It reads:

> "The injection into the trial of political considerations, the quality of the testimony, the attitude of the judge, the dragging out of the trial over six long years aroused a world-wide storm of denunciation. . . ."

Another passage reads in part:

> "The entire machinery of justice was smeared with suspicion, and petitions flooded the office of Governor Alvin T. Fuller in an effort to stay the execution. . . . Sacco and Vanzetti had become for a new generation a classic example of the administering of justice to members of unpopular political minorities."

If the setting down of simple facts like this is held to be sufficient grounds for suppressing one of the most usefully informative books of the American Guide Series, prepared by the WPA and published in Houghton Mifflin's best manner, bearing on its title-page the name of the Secretary of the Commonwealth as coöperating sponsor, is it not obvious that Massachusetts' conscience has grown guiltier and guiltier with the passage of time? And is this not to be expected under the circumstances? And was not the inclusion in the book of references to this notorious trial also to have been expected? This was an event the tragedy of which caused the New York *Nation* to make use of the damning phrase "Massachusetts the Murderer." Are these protesting state officials of Massachusetts fatuous enough to think that the ghost of such a tragedy will not continue to walk until the end of time? Surely they might have thought that some agency some time would have tempted the ghost forth, even if the WPA had not done so in the disclosures of this volume.

But the present enters into the picture as well as the past!

"A reflection on our courts," exclaims one lawyer.

"I told you so," triumphantly declares the individual who was responsible for the Teacher's Oath Bill. And Hearst screams: "WPA Bites the Hand that Feeds Them."

So suppression is threatened, with the alternative of deletion! Most serious of all, the whole thing has been used as a club to attack the Work Relief Administration. Here again, as happened ten years ago, supposedly responsible men are stating a verdict which is not justified by the evidence. And worse than that—quite after the fashion of their predecessors—they have taken refuge in falsehood, and now say (it is reported) in explanation of their right-about-face that the passages to which they object were inserted in the page-proofs after these proofs had received their O.K.

"Stop Press," they command. Eliminate the offensive lines (offensive to their group)! Use the space to tell more about the Boston Massacre and the Boston Tea Party—*i.e.*, about the Revolution which took place more than two hundred and fifty years ago!

But people already know! Newspapers, bidding for circulation, sought sensational passages from the book; and no end of people have by this time read in the passage which relates to the Lowell Commission—apropos of three of Massachusetts' most honorable men:

> "The Commission reported that it believed the trial had been fairly conducted and had reached a proper conclusion. Sacco and Vanzetti were executed following the publication of this report. But nine years after the case a play based on it won the Pulitzer prize, and a brochure on the report of the Lowell Commission was circulated at the Harvard Tercentenary Celebration in 1936."

Said Heywood Broun, on the occasion of the circulation of this document:

> "The tomb is sealed, but the dry bones still rattle."

Cannot Massachusetts realize that these bones will continue to rattle just as long as she persists in trying to justify her crime, and in thinking that evidence of that crime can be hidden and forgotten? The bones of the poor fish-peddler and the good shoemaker, who did not want to fight in any unjustifiable war, but who *did* want to fight—more honorably—for decent conditions for the workers, for a better future for humanity!

One paragraph in the *Massachusetts Guide* thus describes the State:

> "It is noted for its conservatism, yet it exports not only shoes and textiles, but rebels, to all corners of the earth. . . . and time and again their largeness of spirit has burst beyond state borders."

This time the medium for the explosion was composed of the faithful and efficient editors and writers of the finest volume that has yet appeared in the American Guide Series. Yet ex-Governor Ely says this volume should be publicly burned, a la the Nazis in Berlin! Here we have the pettiness and meanness of Massachusetts' activity as against its largeness in sprit. And the question arises—which, this time, is going to win?

*This article is of very special and timely interest as following so soon after our Sacco-Vanzetti issue (August 16th).—*Editors.*

# The Study Table

### A Strange Dialogue

CONVERSATION AT MIDNIGHT. *By Edna St. Vincent Millay. New York: Harper & Brothers. $2.00.*

What is poetry? If anybody should know, it is Miss Millay, who has written some of the loveliest lyrics and noblest sonnets in the English tongue. Miss Harriet Monroe, if we remember rightly, once described Miss Millay as the greatest woman poet since Sappho. This seems like exaggeration—but name a woman poet greater if you can! Certainly there is no one in our American literature to match her—not even Emily Dickinson who, in comparison, is hard in quality and limited in range. As for English literature, we would give Miss Millay primacy over Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Emily Bronte, and even Christine Rossetti. Yes, this great poet of our time ought to know what poetry is.

Yet this latest work of her pen raises curious doubts. Here is the volume labeled "poems," but when one turns to the pages, one wonders where poetry begins and prose ends. It is true that certain of the accepted poetic forms may be found in this book. Thus, there are some verses in the sonnet form, though of a texture so shoddy and of a pattern so grotesque as to be almost unrecognizable. There are a few lyrics which no less a critic than Carl van Doren thinks may find their way into the anthologies. Also, for reasons hard to discover, there are rhymes even in the ends of the most ragtag-and-bobtail lines. But the mass of the material is rough dialogue, without form and void, with rhyme but little reason, and with scarcely a note of inspiration or touch of beauty from first to last. Were it not for occasional phrases here and there, it would seem incredible that Miss Millay could have written this trite, banal, and ugly stuff.

If there be explanation, it is that Miss Millay, a lyricist to her heart's core, has been caught at last by the free verse mania of our time, and has made up her mind to join the crowd. *She,* the master of poetic speech, descending to the level of so-called poets who abandon poetic forms, the great tradition of Milton, Pope, Keats, Byron, Wordsworth, Tennyson, because they have neither the discipline nor genius to write anything but prose of the most obscure and awkward type. Of course, as one turns these pages, one thinks of Walt Whitman who, by the way, has so much to answer for! But there is little of Whitman's bardic grandeur and prophetic passion in these commonplace lines. Robinson Jeffers comes to mind—but the pounding sonority as of the sea, which is in his work, is here reduced to an inert flapping and slapping which suggest the dead and dirty tide by the old fish-wharf. Hart Crane!—even Miss Millay, in her worst moments, could not be as bad as Crane, yet she has plainly been affected by him. No, if we are looking for a model and example, it must be to a lesser "poet" that we must turn—namely, Ogden Nash, whom, curiously enough, Miss Millay herself suggests in her telltale phrase, "As Ogden Nash might put it," on page 47 of this volume. Once get this idea in mind, and *Conversation at Midnight* suddenly takes form and shape. But it also at the same time becomes ridiculous, and its worth as poetry therefore *nil.*

The book is accurately described as a "Conversation." The author takes seven characters—a stockbroker, a painter, an author, a Communist, a Catholic priest, an agnostic gentleman of leisure, a young advertising salesman—places these characters in a house on 10th Street, New York, equips them with an abundance of cigars and liquor but little wit, and sets them talking about anything and everything under the sun. The conversation is conceived in dialogue form, like a play, and is even divided into three acts, or "parts." But there is no dramatic development, no characterization, not even a consistent thread of discourse. Nor does the discussion, even of controversial themes, attain at any time to the level of intellectual distinction. It is all hopelessly dull, not a little vulgar, and without a trace of beauty. One wonders what Miss Millay thought she was doing when she wrote a piece which is neither good poetry nor passable prose.

*Conversation at Midnight* has an unusual history. Completed in manuscript form, it was destroyed in the burning of the Palms Hotel on Sanibel Island. From certain sections of the work already published in *Harper's Magazine,* and then from sheer memory, Miss Millay had to rewrite the whole. An agonizing and astounding feat! Yet, as one sees the result, one wonders why Miss Millay did not take the fire as "a sign!"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

❖ ❖ ❖

### A Verse Play for Radio

THE FALL OF THE CITY. *By Archibald MacLeish. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. 50 cents.*

We have seen no more interesting and stirring book than this in many months. Beautifully printed and bound at the extraordinary price of 50 cents, the volume presents a dramatic poem of great distinction in a wholly new and modern field of art. The author, Mr. MacLeish, has long since earned prominent place among our leading American poets. His *Public Speech, Frescoes for Mr. Rockefeller's City* and especially the famous *Conquistador* are contributions of enduring value to our literature. Now he has tried an experiment, attempted a new form of poetic expression—a verse play written not for the stage, nor even for the closet, but for the broadcasting studio! The result, to say the least, is exciting.

In his admirable Foreword, Mr. MacLeish points out that there are two facts, among others which should have set the poets "storming the [radio] studios for years." The first is that "radio is a mechanism which carries to an audience sounds and nothing but sounds. The radio play consists of words and word equivalents and nothing else. . . . There is only the spoken word"—no distraction of scenery, or actor, or costume. What a chance for the man whose art is poetry! "The ear is the poet's perfect audience, his only true audience." The verse-maker has had no such opportunity to gain "access to this perfect friend" since the days of the Homeric minstrels.

The second fact is "the technique of the radio," at the center of which is the Announcer. "The Announcer," says Mr. MacLeish, "is the most useful dramatic personage since the Greek Chorus. For years modern poets writing for the stage have felt the necessity of contriving some sort of chorus, some sort of commentator." And here he is! "The commentator is

an integral part of radio technique." Again, what a chance for the genius who can use it!

Modestly, yet with enormous dramatic power, Mr. MacLeish tackles the problem to see what he can do. *The Fall of the City* is a poetic play written exclusively for radio performance. As conceived and composed, it could be produced nowhere else than in the broadcasting studio. The central figure is the Announcer, whose voice is heard throughout the performance, sustaining, directing, and interpreting the action. He is conceived as placed in the central plaza of a great city, looking down upon a vast crowd of people gathered to behold a reputed miracle of a woman recently buried in a tomb rising at noon each day to pronounce doom upon the city—the coming of a master to conquer and rule "masterless men." The miracle occurs—you hear the voice of the Dead Woman amid the murmurs of the crowd and the voice of the Announcer excitedly describing what he sees! Then upon the scene, constantly portrayed by the Announcer, there comes a panting Messenger, whose voice is heard stating that a conqueror has this day landed with his army and is advancing upon the city. Then sounds the voice of an Orator, urging the policy of non-resistance:

"Weakness conquers!
Against chainlessness who breaks?
Against wall-lessness who vaults,
Against forcelessness who forces? . . .
Let this conqueror come!
Show him no hindrance!
Suffer his flag and his drum!
Words . . . *win!*"

The scene of all this is always being described at intervals by the Announcer, just as though he were broadcasting a boat race or a coronation. Suddenly, now, there comes a second Messenger. The conqueror is at hand! Now intervene the priests, to exhort the people to trust their gods. A general excitedly interrupts to call the people to arms. Then, over the mountains is seen the advance of the conqueror. He comes —he enters the city—he marches into the square—the crowd falls prostrate before him.

*The Voice of the Announcer*

"He mounts by the pyramid—stamps on the stairway—turns—
His arm rises—his visor is opening . . .
(*There is an instant's breathless silence: then the voice of the Announcer low—almost a whisper*)
There's no one! . . .
There's no one at all! . . . No one! . . .
The helmet is hollow!
The metal is empty! The armor is empty!
I tell you
There's no one at all there!"

It is obvious that *The Fall of the City* is a parable as well as a poem—a parable of our own day. It presents the proposition that a free people is enslaved only by itself—conquered by its own fears and acquiescences. In this philosophical substance of the drama there is material for endless controversy. What will the pacifists say, for example, to the author's satirical and contemptuous presentation of their idealism in the voice of the Orator? But these questions are, for the moment at least, unimportant. What counts is Archibald MacLeish's adaptation of the poetic drama to the uses of radio. On this point we would say that he has written superb and noble verse as the vehicle of a thrilling play. It is to be hoped that Mr. MacLeish himself, and other poets as well, will push on into the region here so gallantly and successfully pioneered.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

---

# Correspondence

### The Money Mystery

Editor of UNITY:

I frequently read UNITY and find in it many things well worth while. However, in the issue of Monday, July 19, I find an editorial entitled "The Gold Bug" that is so far wrong I feel I should call your attention to it.

In the first place, our government is not paying the highest price for gold. Argentina, Japan, Australia, and several other countries have a higher price than $35.00 an ounce.

We are not stimulating the world to produce gold for us to bury at Fort Knox. There has been considerable increase in the production of gold, but even today the production is not adequate for our needs as a basis for the world's currency and for use in the arts. If our price for gold were stimulating production, then the higher price for gold prevailing in the countries I have named would cause the gold to flow to those countries instead of to the United States.

There is little in the present administration's program that I care to defend, but the public is entitled to know the truth about gold. There are several reasons why gold is flowing to the United States. First, we have a tariff that prohibits the shipment of goods to this country; secondly, this is one of the safest places in the world for storing gold; and, thirdly, the great war preparations in Europe have stimulated buying of war materials in America.

Whatever gold flows to the United States must, under our present system, be turned over to the government. It is true that the government is sterilizing this gold, which is undoubtedly a sane policy at this time. What I object to in this program is that in exchange for the gold, we issue money obtained from the sale of bonds bearing interest. In other words we do pay a low rate of interest on this gold that is being acquired.

I should like to see all the gold in the world come to America. If we had it all here locked up in Fort Knox, it would be impossible for any nation to carry on war, for gold is the one essential for war. It is the one thing that buys goods throughout the world. There is no harm in accumulating a vast quantity of gold at Fort Knox. In fact any nation in the world would be delighted to have our supply. Our country is not greedy in buying this gold and storing it. It is merely taking control of the gold that comes to this country as a result of the conditions I have described.

Apparently the writer of this article doesn't understand gold at all. He says "$35.00 an ounce or just 60 per cent more than in the great boom year 1929." He doesn't know the difference, apparently, between *price* of gold and *value* of gold. In the late twenties gold rose in value with the greatest rapidity in the world's history. For a little lump of gold we had to give more of every commodity. As a result, the prices of commodities fell. This price collapse is what caused the depression. Gold today is far more valuable than it was in prewar days. The only way we can correct the price level is to raise the price of gold. In other words, today we say that 1/35 of an ounce of gold is a dollar. Before 1933 about 1/20 of an ounce of gold was a dollar. We revalued the dollar to correct the great increase in the value of gold which is the measuring stick of values.

This country is not going to suffer any loss except the low interest charge as a result of acquiring this vast quantity of gold, for the value of gold is not likely to fall rapidly for some time to come. In the meantime an increase in demand for gold because of increased use of it as currency and in the arts will undoubtedly maintain its value at something like its present price.

It isn't necessary for us to sell the gold or to find some one who wants to buy it. The whole world will take gold when it can get it because it is best adapted as use for money. It is universal, non-perishable and represents high value in a small quantity of metal. The writer of this article calls it a "ridiculous valuation." This, of course, is absurd.

It is strange that the public seems to know little about gold

## The Field

(*Continued from Page* 18)

out profit. There was no trick behind this offer; it was practical proof that "the making of shells was anathema" to this company and its workers. The offer was refused and the Government decided that it could get along without shells made by Ransomes and Rapier. "If there were no profits to be made," said the manager, "it would alter the minds of a great number of industrialists and bankers toward these [war] preparations." The Government apparently agreed with this analysis.

*Nofrontier News Service.*

## Correspondence

(*Continued from Page* 31)

and for that reason I am sorry to see UNITY helping to confuse the mind with such misstatements as occur in this editorial.

We are not spending money to buy metal. We are exchanging paper money for the metal and the process can be reversed when the occasion comes, without disturbing our monetary system.

What I advocate is a monetary authority appointed by Congress, that will take charge of our monetary affairs and regulate the value of our money.

The writer of this editorial probably doesn't know that the price of gold in London is changed almost every day. It is quoted in our newspapers from day to day. This means, of course, that the amount of gold represented by the pound sterling varies from day to day. This has tended to keep prices stable in the British Isles and to promote prosperous relations with the colonies. Some day America will adopt a monetary policy of a similar nature which will prevent wide fluctuation in prices by adjusting from time to time the quantity of gold represented by the dollar, so that when the value of gold rises or falls, prices will remain stable.

We have had a dishonest dollar, one that has cheated debtor and creditor alike. It is one of the most outrageous injustices that the world has ever known. It is one thing that UNITY should be fighting against, but before you can undertake such a task, you must understand about gold.

I regret that I had occasion to criticize anything in UNITY, but feel you would understand the motive and be glad to be enlightened.

FRANK E. GANNETT.

*Rochester, New York*

[NOTE: Mr. Gannett is the head of the Gannett Newspapers, one of the most important and enlightened newspaper chains in the country. We are glad to publish his able and informing statement on the gold question, which offers certain corrections of our editorial. It should be added, in fairness, that the data contained in the editorial in question was taken from an article by the financial editor of the Chicago *Tribune*.—Editors.]

### John Brown and Sacco-Vanzetti

Editor of UNITY:

I have just been reading your Sacco-Vanzetti Memorial number, and am writing you to point out what I conceive to be a grossly unjust parallel which you make between these two men, who may well have been innocent victims of class injustice, and another man who was hanged in Virginia seventy-seven years ago. As you have previously expressed admiration for John Brown, you will perhaps permit me to point out the injustice of this comparison.

As I understand the case, the objection, which I share, to the execution which took place ten years ago, is based on the assumption that the defendants were innocent, or at least that their guilt was not sufficiently proved. I take it that you, and the others who interested themselves in the case, would have had little or nothing to say in protest had you been convinced of their guilt.

Am I to understand that you are, at this late date, raising any doubt as to John Brown's guilt of the crimes with which he was charged? Do you deny that at Harper's Ferry he killed five persons either with his own hand, or through the agency of others in his band? I pass over the murders he committed in Kansas and confine this discussion to Harper's Ferry.

When he was tried he was charged with treason, conspiring with slaves, and first degree murder. Omitting for the sake of simplifying matters the first two charges, is there the slightest doubt that he was guilty of first degree murder, not once but several times?

The above are some of the reasons why I suggest that you are doing a disservice to Sacco and Vanzetti in placing them "side by side with John Brown." The latter may be dismissed as a bloodthirsty monomaniac, guilty of many other crimes besides those for which he finally paid with his own life.

MARCUS TAYLOR ANDERSON.

*Watsonville, California.*

**NOTICE**

**Libraries or interested individuals may obtain a number of recent copies of The Nation, The New Masses, and Unity by writing to**

**Phillip Gold**

**548 Linwood Street**

**Brooklyn, N. Y.**

**Read This Forthcoming Manual of Constructive Humanism**

**Twelve Religions and Modern Life**

**By**

**Har Dayal, M.A., Ph.D.**

**Author of "The Bodhisattva Doctrine," "Hints for Self-Culture," etc.**

**Two Shillings Sixpence, post free**

**Ready in December**

**Modern Culture Institute, 34 Churchill Road, Edgware (Middx.) England**